## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the Office Action mailed August 20, 1997, together with the references cited therewith, and has amended his application accordingly.

Typographical errors and omissions in the specification have been corrected.

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Eshel et al patent no. 5,535,375.

As to claim 1, Eshel et al is said to teach a method for providing simultaneous access to a common file on a computer network comprising at least one computer, said method including the steps of:

partitioning a first memory on said at least one computer to provide a first user with a first partition to store updates to files corresponding to said first user, said first memory at least partially inaccessible to a second user

partitioning a second memory on said at least one computer to provide said second user with a second partition to store updates to files corresponding to said second user, said second memory at least partially inaccessible to said first user

selectively storing desired updates from said first and second user partitions in said first common partition.

Nothing in Eshel *et al* teaches or renders obvious the method for providing simultaneous access to a common file on a computer network comprising at least one computer which includes the step of storing user update data in a user partition while maintaining common data unchanged, as claimed in claim 1 as amended.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brantley, Jr. et al patent no. 4,980,822, in view of Eshel et al patent no. 5,535,375.

As to claim 1, Brantley, Jr. et al is said to teach a method for providing simultaneous access to a common file on a computer network comprising at least one computer, said method including the steps of:

partitioning a first memory on said at least one computer to provide a first user with a first partition to store updates to files corresponding to said first user, said first memory at least partially inaccessible to a second user,

partitioning a second memory on said at least one computer to provide said second user with a second partition to store updates to files corresponding to said second user, said second memory at least partially inaccessible to said first user,

selectively storing desired updates from said first and second user partitions in said first common partition.

Brantley, Jr. et al is further said to teach a partition storage system, but not explicitly teach the file sharing, while Eshel et al is said to teach a name space to store names of the files and data area to store files for files shared by clients

The Examiner has held Brantley, Jr. et al and Eshel et al are analogous arts and can be combined to reject claims 1-7 and that it would have been obvious in light of the teachings in Eshel et al to add a name space to store names of the files and data area to store files for files shared by clients to Brantley, Jr. et al.

The combination of Brantley, Jr. et al and Eshel et al, however, do not render obvious the method for providing simultaneous access to a common file on a computer network comprising at least one computer which includes the step of storing user update data in a user partition while maintaining common data unchanged, as claimed in claim 1 as amended.

Claims 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al patent no. 4,897,782, in view of Loucks et al patent no. 5,634,122. Bennett et al is said to teach a method for providing simultaneous access to a common file on a computer network, said network including at least two local computers and at least one remote computer coupled to each of said at least two local computers said method including the steps of:

partitioning memories on said local computers into journal partitions that store updates to said file;

partitioning memories on said local computers into local library partitions that store information from respective ones of said journal files;

receiving updates on said remote computer from each of said at least two local computers;

partitioning a memory on said remote computer into a remote partition that stores said updates from said at least two local computers.

However, Bennett et al does not explicitly teach the steps of updating at least one of said journal files while its associated computer is disconnected from said remote computer, and transmitting said updates from said associated computer to said remote computer after said remote computer is reconnected with said remote computer.

Loucks et al teaches that a client caches data when connected to a server. Thus, when a client and a server are disconnected, the client updates the cached data. Upon reconnecting with the server, the client propagates all the updates to the server.

The examiner has held that Bennett et al and Loucks et al are analogous arts and can be combined to reject claim 8 and that it would have been obvious in light of the teachings of Loucks et al to add the steps of caching common data from the server, updating the cached data in the client when the client and the server are disconnected, and propagating the updates to the server upon reconnection of the server and the client, to the teachings in Bennett et al.

The combination of Bennett et al and Loukes, however, do not render obvious the method for providing simultaneous access to a common file on a computer network by storing and propagating update data only and leaving the common file unchanged as claimed in claim 8 as now amended.

New claims 9 and 10 depend from independent claim 1 and thus distinguish over the prior art of record as discussed above.

New claims 11-13 were added to clearly distinguish the invention of the present application. Nothing in the prior art of record disclose or make obvious the use of an update partition defined in a physical storage device storing update data provided by a user representing changes to the common data in user selected data fields in a common partition while maintaining common data unchanged as claimed in independent claim 11.

Nothing in the prior art of record disclose or make obvious the steps of storing update data in an update partition while maintaining common data unchanged, and merging selected update data from one or more update partitions into a common partition as claimed in independent claim 13.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections contained in the present Office Action in light of the amendments to the application, the new claims, and remarks presented herein and allow the claims to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Irell & Manella LLP

Bruce D. Kuyper

Bruce Kuyper, Reg. No. 33,937

Irell & Manella LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276

(310) 277-1010
(310) 203-7199 Facsimile